

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Blew, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Department of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:45 a.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Texas.

RUSSIAN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to talk about the “Abolish ICE” movement and the reasons that is a misconceived idea by some on the left, but first I feel compelled to respond just briefly to some of the comments made by our friend from New York, the Democratic leader.

First of all, the Democratic leader says we need to have hearings on the matter of Russian interference in our elections. I would remind the Democratic leader that we have been doing that for a long time—ever since the intelligence community assessment was released at the end of the Obama administration documenting Russia’s meddling in the election. That assessment was released on an unclassified basis. It is on the website of the Director of National Intelligence if anybody wants to read it.

Also, I would submit to him the 29-page indictment that Robert Mueller had issued by a grand jury against 12 Russian intelligence officers. It lays out in minute detail what the Russians were doing to try to cause confusion and undermine public confidence in our elections. As a matter of fact, this afternoon the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is hearing from some Obama administration officials on why they didn’t do more to stop it back when President Obama was in office when they knew very clearly what was going on but did not do—well, did virtually nothing to stop it.

So I would say to my friend from New York, the Democratic leader, there have been a lot of hearings, and the hearings are ongoing. Obviously, Special Counsel Mueller has issued this indictment. I only wish that it was more than a name-and-shame exercise because there is no chance the Russians will extradite these intelligence officers over here for a trial. But I think it does serve a useful educational purpose by pointing out in minute detail what the Russians have been up to. They have upped their game in a way that is surprising to many people, having used everything from propaganda, to social media, to cyber theft of information like the Clinton emails and the DNC emails during the course of the last election. It has gotten very sophis-

ticated. We better be about fixing it and getting ready for the next election rather than coming to the floor and engaging in the favorite Washington pastime, which is the blame game.

Senator SCHUMER said we need to issue sanctions against Russia. Well, I have in front of me about two single-spaced pages of actions that we have taken since the beginning of the Trump administration to support our allies against Russian aggression and to punish Russian misconduct, whether it is in the elections or otherwise. I would entertain—I understand the Senator from Colorado has some additional sanctions he thinks would be appropriate, and I think that would be something that would sting.

Rather than just sending a press release or trying to message this or use it for partisan political purposes, let’s consider additional sanctions that will actually discourage and hold accountable the Russians for their election meddling and deter them, hopefully, from doing it again.

I understand the fourth thing my friend from New York said is that we need to stop criticizing the Comey FBI and the Department of Justice under the Obama administration. Well, it is pretty clear from the investigations that have occurred that something rotten was happening at the leadership of the FBI. Just to listen to Mr. Strzok—and his protestations that there was no bias associated with those investigations are patently unbelievable. It is unbelievable, not credible.

So I understand that the Democratic leader wants to focus his attention on the President. That is his prerogative, and, indeed, he has been the leader of the anti-Trump resistance since President Trump was elected.

Many of us do disagree with the President’s assessment of the intelligence, as I have suggested. I firmly believe there is solid evidence of Russian meddling in the election. I think President Putin misrepresented the facts. I am not surprised by that given who he is and how he operates. As the Democratic leader said, as a former KGB colonel, he is accustomed to dissembling and distorting, manipulating information in a way that serves his purpose.

I think we should be absolutely clear. We all support the men and women who are the professionals who make up the intelligence community in this country, many of whom expose themselves to great danger, and, indeed, many have lost their lives trying to protect this country against adversaries around the world. I think the findings of the intelligence community assessment during the end of the Obama administration provides a roadmap to what the Russians did, as did the indictment of the 12 Russian GRU intelligence officials.

We better wake up. Rather than the blame game and pointing fingers, we better get ready for the next election, the midterm election in 2018.

I think there is a lot we can do together, but as long as this becomes a political, partisan, stop-Trump-at-all-costs effort, I don’t think we are going to make much progress.

I will conclude this part of my remarks by saying that I trust our intelligence community. I trust their assessment that there was Russian meddling in the election. But I also trust the investigation so far, which has shown absolutely no collusion with the Trump campaign and Russian intelligence activity leading up to the election. That is what I think has the President so spun up, because he feels as though this is an attack on him personally. I wish we could separate those two. But, indeed, our Democratic colleagues don’t want to separate them because they realize this is the best way to keep this story going for as long as they can through the next election and, who knows, through the next Presidential election as well.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about this misguided effort to abolish ICE, Immigration and Customs Enforcement. This is the operational component of the Department of Homeland Security. We have seen this movement in hashtags on Instagram, on T-shirts. We have watched protestors who showed up in California when ICE agents were trying to investigate the trafficking of children. Can you imagine these protestors interfering with an investigation into the crime of human trafficking of children? But that is not all. Some of the House Democrats have introduced legislation to eliminate ICE.

Of course, any sensible person would tell you that eliminating ICE is reckless, which is why I recently introduced a resolution with 14 of our colleagues denouncing these radical calls in the strongest of terms. This is just reckless and naive, this “Abolish ICE” movement. It is a move that would be fundamentally irresponsible.

Based on one recent poll, close to 70 percent of the American people, when asked about it, opposed the idea—and for good reason. ICE was created, after all, in 2003 in response to the discovery that many of the 9/11 hijackers had exploited holes in our immigration enforcement and overstayed their tourist visas and attended flight schools without a proper visa. We know what happened on that terrible day, 9/11/2001. We know that hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals overstay their visas every year illegally. Without ICE, those unlawfully residing in our country, in violation of their visas, would be allowed to stay indefinitely. Is that what the “Abolish ICE” movement is about—eliminating enforcement of our immigration laws and allowing people who flout those laws to succeed in staying here in the United States in violation of those immigration laws?

Of course, abolishing ICE would mean ending all of the agency’s programs and functions. It would mean allowing

dangerous criminals, including potential terrorists who are in our country, to remain here. It would mean scrapping the ICE Cyber Crime Center's investigation of child exploitation online. It would mean ending the ICE Blue Campaign to rescue human trafficking victims and provide them with a safe place to stay and other services. The Blue Campaign was just unanimously authorized by Congress, by the way, this year, and abolishing ICE would eliminate it. Abolishing ICE would mean doing away with the unit that focuses on human rights violators and war crimes. That unit is currently pursuing close to 2,000 leads. It would eliminate initiatives like Operation Community Shield, which combats the proliferation of transnational criminal gangs.

I hope our colleagues understand what they are encouraging when they say we should abolish ICE. I think it is incumbent on them to explain their rationale to the hard-working officials who are on the frontlines, fighting against human trafficking, child exploitation, and illegal immigration. What do they have to say to those people who risk their safety—perhaps even their lives—to enforce those important laws, much less to those whose jobs would be on the line?

There are some important statistics relating to Homeland Security Investigations, which is a critical part of ICE, that our Democratic friends who are encouraging the abolition of ICE should know about: 8,887, which is the number of visa applications that Homeland Security refused based on terrorist connections or other derogatory information; 904, which is the number of sexually exploited children identified and/or rescued by Homeland Security in 2017; 3,945, which is the number of cases initiated based on human smuggling last year; 4,735, which is the number of transnational gang members arrested in the United States in 2017; and 980,000, which is the number of pounds of narcotics Homeland Security Investigations seized in 2017, which included thousands of pounds of deadly drugs—like fentanyl—that help fuel the opioid crisis.

ICE plays a leading role in all of these areas. If the critics were to get their wish and if ICE were abolished, the numbers for all of these items would be zero because Homeland Security Investigations could not exist without ICE.

There is more. Think about the close to 33,000 criminal arrests made by Homeland Security Investigations last year—90 criminal arrests each day. Without ICE, these criminals would still be on the streets, endangering our communities. The \$524 million in illicit currency that was seized would be back in circulation, being used in illegal transactions. There were 7,000 pounds of heroin, 57,000 pounds of methamphetamines, and 260,000 pounds of cocaine impounded last year. That poison would all be back on the market and being sold in our communities.

I hope our colleagues who are calling for the abolition of ICE are prepared to explain their reasoning for abolishing an agency that combats illegal drug sales and online exploitation and helps protect our Nation's borders. My respectful suggestion would be that they need to spend a little more time thanking these public servants for the critical role ICE plays in keeping all of us safe. Maybe they should spend a little time getting to know the ICE officers who go to work every day and do their duty, protecting our country.

Earlier this month, Vice President PENCE talked about this. He reiterated President Trump's words of support—that the men and women of ICE are incredible people. These include the more than 20,000 investigators, field officers, special agents, and analysts, who, as the Vice President said, “stand up for the rule of law in this nation.”

Every day, ICE confronts criminal illegal immigrants who endanger our communities. They fight vicious gangs like MS-13 and stop human smugglers and child traffickers, sometimes endangering their own safety.

In 2017, the Vice President pointed out that attacks on Customs and Border Protection agents had increased by nearly 75 percent. Deliberately fostering resentment, anger, and contempt for ICE and our other law enforcement officials obviously puts our officers in additional danger. This is reckless, not to mention, again, dangerous.

ICE critics try to justify their calls by pointing out the situation at the border in which certain families were separated but are now in the process of being reunited. We all agree these families should be reunited, and I know the Presiding Officer has authored important legislation to change the law to make sure that families are kept together when they come across the border and claim asylum. But then there are cases processed in an expedited fashion in front of an immigration judge, so if they have some legitimate claim to asylum or immigration benefits, they can get that heard.

Also, one of the objectives, of course, is to eliminate the failed catch-and-release policies of the past, which have done nothing but encourage additional illegal immigration and reward criminal organizations for whom this is a business model, exploiting gaps in our immigration laws. Unfortunately, when we have Members of Congress who resist fixing those gaps, filling those gaps, and solving the problem, it does nothing but enrich these criminal organizations for whom this is gold.

It is clear that the situation at our border is a crisis. In 2014, President Obama called it a humanitarian crisis when tens of thousands of unaccompanied children came across the border, and that continues today because we haven't fixed the problem on a bipartisan basis, even though those solutions are readily available.

Those who criticize the enforcement of our immigration laws, the so-called

zero tolerance policy, have focused on separating families. So what we have tried to do, since we all agree families should not be separated, is to provide a means for those once separated to be reunited and detained in appropriate facilities and have their cases heard on an expedited basis before an immigration judge. Not fixing the problem will simply encourage more of the same.

Unfortunately, as I said, our colleagues who refuse to be part of the solution actually are part of the problem. We know who wins in this game; it is the criminal organizations who are, as one expert said, “commodity agnostic.” They will traffic in children; they will traffic in guns; they will traffic in drugs—anything that makes them a buck. This is a very, very lucrative business model for them. Unfortunately, when we don't fix the problem by plugging the holes, we are unwittingly helping to support that business model.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

TARIFFS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I particularly enjoyed the remarks of my distinguished friend from Texas, a good man, who makes a real difference around here.

I rise today to speak on the administration's recent actions regarding global tariff policy. I am one of the President's strongest supporters in most matters. I have been steadfast in working with President Trump on our shared economic agenda, especially passage of the most important piece of tax reform legislation in a generation.

Tax reform is already providing significant relief to families and businesses, large and small. Businesses across the country are now more globally competitive and are investing in their workforce through wage hikes, bonuses, and increased 401(k) contributions that are benefiting American workers, families, and their communities. But this roaring economy, which we worked together to build for American workers and businesses, is at risk because of the President's trade policies.

Tariffs against our allies and partners in Europe, Canada, Mexico, and around the world are already harming American farmers and manufacturers and raising costs for American families. If this continues, our economy will suffer.

I have long advocated for implementing enforceable international rules to level the playing field for American businesses, innovators, and entrepreneurs, and I have consistently fought to protect U.S. intellectual property rights around the globe. I have also been committed to advancing a trade agenda that serves the American people. But the administration's recent actions are misguided and will harm, rather than protect, the American people.

The administration has implemented or threatened global tariffs on approximately \$500 billion of goods. Pure and simple, tariffs are attacks on American businesses and consumers. These actions put American families and businesses at risk and threaten to undermine the success of tax reform. Furthermore, they are closing off international markets that our farmers, ranchers, and other exporters depend on.

I have heard from businesses from my home State of Utah that have already been hurt by the imposition of steel and aluminum tariffs. Utah manufacturers are struggling with higher steel and aluminum costs and, as a result, are struggling to compete with foreign manufacturers.

I have also been hearing from U.S. auto manufacturers and share their deep concerns about the consequences of raising tariffs on cars, trucks, and automotive parts. A decision to raise auto tariffs would lead to a net job loss and lower capital investment in the U.S. auto sector by increasing costs and reducing choice. The result will be lower demand for cars in the United States and lower auto sales and production.

While I share the administration's goal of strengthening American manufacturing, tariffs on cars and auto parts would directly injure one of our country's most important manufacturing sectors.

Some of my colleagues have been pressing the need for legislation to restrict the trade authorities that Congress has delegated to the President, and I have been sympathetic to their efforts. If the administration continues forward with its misguided and reckless reliance on tariffs, I will work to advance trade legislation to curtail Presidential trade authority. I am discussing legislative options with colleagues both on and off the Finance Committee, and I will continue to do so. However, I would much rather work with the administration to advance a trade agenda that serves the interests of the American people and job creators.

I want the President to hold our trading partners accountable. I want him to negotiate strong deals that help our U.S. companies and workers compete around the globe.

In particular, I agree with the President that China utilizes mercantilist trade policies to benefit state-owned and Communist Party-controlled firms, harming American companies and workers. We have to help U.S. businesses, innovators, farmers, and ranchers compete globally, and that means we have to confront the challenges posed by China. That is why I have recommended to the President that it is time to engage in negotiations with China, using a target of strategy to address their unfair trade practices. While those efforts are under way, the administration should not impose further tariffs on our allies and partners,

particularly on autos and auto parts. In that way, the President can safeguard the economic growth we have worked so hard to achieve and give himself a strong negotiating position with China.

The administration's actions on trade have hurt American manufacturers, farmers, ranchers, workers, and families. The President has asked all of those groups to endure losses so that he can negotiate winning trade agreements. All are watching to see what the President will achieve at the negotiating table in return for their sacrifice. However, now is the time for the President to undertake that effort. I believe that I will support him if he does undertake that effort, and I hope he will.

I care a great deal for the President. I want him to be a success. These approaches are not successful. They are not the way to go. I want to help the President to get around those and do the things that he ought to be doing to strengthen our economy and to strengthen our workers and our businesses.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to oppose the nomination of James Blew for Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development at the Department of Education. I am opposing this nomination on behalf of the millions of parents, students, and teachers who made it clear during Secretary DeVos's confirmation process that they believe the Department of Education's top priorities should be helping to educate our students and supporting our public schools. They made it clear when they posted on social media, voicing concerns about Secretary DeVos's lack of experience and knowledge during her hearing in front of our HELP Committee, when they overwhelmed the Senate switchboard urging their Senators to vote against her nomination, and when they took to the streets to protest her nomination and her ideological agenda.

They made it clear that they believe every student has the right to a high quality public education—no matter where they live, how they learn, or how much money their parents make. Despite an unprecedented tie-breaking vote by Vice President PENCE, Secretary DeVos has ignored the public's overwhelming rejection to her extreme ideology. Instead, she continues to promote her privatization agenda, trying to shift taxpayer funds away from our public schools.

She is ignoring key parts of our Nation's K-12 law by refusing to hold

States accountable for the success of our most vulnerable students. She is making it easier for predatory for-profit colleges and corporations to take advantage of students, rolling back protections for students and dismantling the unit that investigates claims of fraud and abuse. Time and again, she is failing our students and her duty to protect their civil rights.

She has tried to shrink the Office for Civil Rights, has rescinded guidance for schools on how to investigate claims of campus sexual assault, and has rolled back rules that protect transgender students, students of color, and students with disabilities.

All of those students, parents, and teachers who voiced their concerns about Secretary DeVos during her nomination have not gone away. They are still making their voices heard, demanding that the Department of Education start standing up for students.

Unfortunately, Mr. Blew, whose nomination is before us, has made it clear that he is cut from the same cloth. During his career, Mr. Blew has advocated for vouchers. He has failed to adequately support teachers with the tools they need to help their students succeed. He has even worked closely with and helped to fund Secretary DeVos's privatization efforts.

The Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development advises the Secretary in developing and implementing policy, which impacts every student in our country. It is a critical position. Given the actions and decisions by Secretary DeVos, it is very clear that we need an independent voice in this position. Unfortunately, Mr. Blew has proven that he is not up for that challenge. For that reason, I will vote against his nomination. I ask my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today the Senate is finally voting to confirm James Blew, who has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development at the U.S. Department of Education. He is well-qualified to lead that office. For 20 years, in various roles, he has advocated for improving educational opportunities by overseeing grants to low-income, high-risk schools. He has a M.B.A. from Yale University. He will be in charge of helping to manage the Department's budget and ensure that programs are working as intended.

Mr. Blew's sin with some of my friends on the other side is that he is in favor of giving low-income children a choice of a better school and in favor of

public charter schools, which gives teachers more freedom to teach and parents more freedom to choose the school for their child.

No one should be surprised that a Republican president would nominate such an Assistant Secretary of Education. Every Republican president has nominated assistant secretaries of education and secretaries of education—I was one of them—who support giving low-income children more choices of good schools—the same choices that wealthier children have—such as public charter schools.

As far as public charter schools go, every Democratic president since 1990, when the first charter schools were formed, has supported public charter schools.

Mr. Blew did not deserve to be subjected to the unreasonable delay and obstruction that the Democrats have given to his nomination. He was nominated on September 28, 2017, 292 days ago. We held a hearing on November 15, 2017, 244 days ago.

Going back to the Clinton administration, there had been no hearings for this position, but I held one anyway, as chairman of the committee, as a courtesy to Democrats. Then, Democrats forced Mr. Blew's nomination to be returned to the President at the end of the congressional session last year.

Let's see how that compares to how President Obama's first Assistant Secretary for the same job was treated. Carmel Martin was nominated on March 18, 2009, and was confirmed by voice vote without a hearing on May 1, 2009, 44 days later.

It is one thing to vote against a presidential nominee. That is appropriate. Any of us can do that. I think it is wrong to always vote against a presidential nominee just because you disagree with that nominee's point of view. Why would you not expect a Republican president to nominate an assistant secretary who favors giving poor children choices of good schools and supports public charter schools that were invented by the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota and were supported by every Democratic president since 1990? So this unreasonable delay of a well-qualified Assistant Secretary is not good for the Senate, not good for the country, and not good for children who need that sort of leadership.

I support and urge my colleagues to vote for Mr. Blew.

I yield floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Blew nomination?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 156 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Smith
Carper	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Casey	Leahy	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Duckworth	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Harris	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Johnny Isakson, John Kennedy, John Thune, John Boozman, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Tim Scott, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Cory Gardner, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term

of fourteen years from February 1, 2018, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 157 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Boozman	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Capito	Heller	Roberts
Cardin	Hoeven	Rounds
Carper	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Coons	Johnson	Shaheen
Corker	Jones	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	King	Tester
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Harris	Murray
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Stabenow
Duckworth	Markey	Udall
Durbin	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 66, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on Executive Calendar No. 595 be considered expired at 2:25 p.m. and the Senate immediately vote on the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and that following disposition of the nomination, the Senate vote on cloture on the Oldham nomination.